

REMARKS

The claims are 1-3.

The above amendment is responsive to points set forth in the Official Action and is based on the Examiner's helpful suggestions.

In this regard, claims 1-3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over either of Brooks '012 or Champagne '381, combined with Ramannujam et al., "Instant Holography", Appl. Phys. Lett., Vol. 74(21) (1999).

The Official Action, at page 4, states that:

The applicant could obviate the rejection by excluding the use of coherent light sources or excluding the formation of holograms or gratings through a negative limitation recited in the claim.

In reply, claim 1 now excludes the formation of holograms or gratings by the interaction of the first and second light beams.

Claims 1-3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over either of Brooks '012 or Champagne '381, combined with Natansohn et al. '381, Bieringer et al. '846, Eich et al. '859 and Savant et al. '221.

At the bottom of page 6 of the Official Action, it is stated:

The examiner notes that if the light is an incoherent "continuous-spectrum light source" [0025], then the formation of interference fringes does not occur and the process is indeed non-holographic as argued.


This rejection is also overcome by reciting that the process is non-holographic.

No further issues remaining, allowance of this application is respectfully requested.

If the Examiner has any comments or proposals for expediting prosecution, please contact undersigned at the telephone number below.

Respectfully submitted,

Takashi FUKUDA et al.

By: 
Matthew M. Jacob
Registration No. 25,154
Attorney for Applicants

MJ/da
Washington, D.C. 20006-1021
Telephone (202) 721-8200
Facsimile (202) 721-8250
April 26, 2004